

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application after this Amendment. Claims 1, 11-13, and 23-24 are independent. New claims 13-24 are presented to the Examiner for consideration. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Parulski et al.* (USP 5,668,597); rejected claims 4-7 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harada et al.* (USP 6,108,036) in view of *Parulski et al.*; and rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harada et al.* in view of *Parulski et al.* and further in view of *Dischert* (USP 6,040,869). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on December 2, 2004. During the interview, the Examiner presented his interpretation of claim 1 with regard to the *Parulski et al.* reference. During the interview, Applicant agreed to submit further remarks regarding this issue. Additionally, the parties agreed that *Parulski et al.* fails to teach or suggest a matrix of transferring gates, and further fails to teach or suggest transferring gates, each associated with a photoelectric

transferring device as recited in the claims. Based upon these discussions, Applicant presents the enclosed remarks for consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a solid imaging device in which pixel information of two adjoining lines composes color information of three primary colors, said solid imaging device comprises a matrix of transferring gates to which gate pulses for transferring only the pixel information of pairs of two adjoining lines with intervals of a plurality of lines to vertical transferring routes are applied when image signals with low definition are produced.

In contrast to the above claim recitation, *Parulski et al.* discloses an electronic camera with rapid automatic focus of an image upon a progressive scan image sensor. Specifically, *Parulski et al.* discloses at col. 5, lines 37-44 as follows:

Between the vertical and horizontal registers is the fast dump structure 62, which is further described in the Performance Specification document for the KAI-310 sensor. By setting a suitable positive potential on a fast dump gate line FDG, charge from the row (line) of pixel values currently adjacent to the fast dump structure 62 is transferred from the CCD channel directly into the sensor substrate 64 rather than to the horizontal register 60.

However, Applicant submits that these teachings are insufficient to disclose the solid imaging device comprising a

matrix of transferring gates to which gate pulses for transferring only the pixel information of pairs of two adjoining lines with intervals of a plurality of lines to vertical transferring routes are applied when image signals with low definition are produced. Based upon the deficiencies of the teachings of *Parulski et al.* with regard to the matrix of transferring gates, and as discussed during the interview on December 2, 2004, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 12 each recite a matrix of transferring gates. As noted above with regard to claim 1, *Parulski et al.* fails to teach or suggest a matrix of transferring gates. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 12 are not anticipated by *Parulski et al.*

By this Amendment, Applicant has presented new claims 13-24 for consideration by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, a solid imaging device comprising transferring gates, each associated with a photoelectric transferring device. As discussed during the interview on December 2, 2004, *Parulski et al.* fails to teach transferring gates, each associated with a photoelectric transferring device, to which gate pulses for transferring only the pixel information of

pairs of two adjoining lines with intervals of a plurality of lines to vertical transferring routes are applied when image signals with low definition are produced. As *Parulski et al.* fails to teach or suggest transferring gates, each associated with a photoelectric transferring device, as recited in claim 13, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 23 and 24 each recite, *inter alia*, transferring gates, each associated with a photoelectric transferring device. As *Parulski et al.* fails to teach or suggest this claim element, it is respectfully submitted that claims 23 and 24 are not anticipated by *Parulski et al.* It is further respectfully submitted that claims 14-22 are not anticipated by *Parulski et al.* for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 13 at least based upon their dependency on claim 13.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any


overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

BY 

 Marc S. Weiner, #32,181


MSW/CMV/jdm
0879-0277P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000